



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/714,541

11/14/2003

Alexander G. Gibson

13938-E

2536

7590 03/25/2010
LAW OFFICE OF
DOUGLAS E. McKINLEY, Jr.
P.O. BOX 202
RICHLAND, WA 99352

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2169

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/25/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/714,541	Applicant(s) GIBSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Greta L. Robinson	Art Unit 2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-28 and 32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application. Claims 23-32 have status withdrawn. Claim has been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-22 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webber US Patent 5,909,570 in view of Lennon US Patent 7,287,018 B2.

Art Unit: 2169

Regarding claim 1, **Webber** teaches a method for extracting and converting data in a computer system from one or more information sources into a common format [note: Abstract *“facilitate conversion between data formats”*; col. 2 lines 60-67 *extracting and converting data*], comprising:

receiving said information sources in a computer system [note: Figure 1; col. 6 lines 57-64 *“the inbound computer dataset 2 represents the incoming information from remote sending computer’s dataset that is to be received and processed by the host computer”*];

receiving at least one pattern descriptor selected from a graphical user interface [note: col. 7 lines 9-38 *field descriptions 400 (parameters needed for mapping)*];

receiving one or more templates, each of said templates having said at least one pattern descriptor [note: col. 6 line 65 through col. 7 line 9 *“the template mapping system 10 of the present invention, and is thereby restructured and reformatted to be compatible with receiving”*];

applying said one or more templates to said information sources [note: col. 7 lines 39-45 *mapping template rules*];

generating said data in a common format by parsing said information sources with a universal parsing agent that utilizes said one or more templates [note: col. 7 lines 39-51; col. 4 lines 23-49, col. 13 lines 23-49; column 6 line 57 through column 7 line 21 *“inbound data set is processed by the template mapping system 10”* to reconstruct and reformat data into compatible form by direct access software 20 (i.e. parsing agent)];

and

Art Unit: 2169

storing said data in said common format [note: col. 7 lines 39-51; col. 4 lines 23-49, col. 13 lines 23-49]. Although Weber teaches the invention as cited above, they do not explicitly teach that the pattern descriptor is selected. Lennon teaches pattern descriptors are selected as a tool to perform processing such as transformations, presentations, etc. [see: column 15 line 65 through column 16 line 17]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Lennon with Weber because Lennon further shows options based on rule processing on how an application selects a particular descriptor.

Regarding claims 2-3, “wherein storing said data in said common format, said method further comprises communicating said data to an application configured to process said common format ... wherein said application is a database application” [note: Weber col. 5 lines 48-65 *EDI Application*].

Regarding claim 4, “wherein said common format for said structured data is an Extensible markup Language (XML) format [note: Weber Figure 14; col. 2 lines 16-54 *custom formats allow for conversion and exchange of information*].

Regarding claims 5 and 6, “generating one or more templates by selecting a file from said information sources, and having a user select one or more pattern descriptors to describe said file ...further comprising permitting said user to define said one or more

Art Unit: 2169

pattern descriptors” [note: Weber Figures 1-3, col. 9 lines 5-12 rules define how data will be processed; col. 10 lines 3-7; also note col. 14 lines 32-67].

Regarding claim 7, “wherein before receiving and said one or more templates, said method further comprises permitting said user to select one or more templates from a template library” [note: Weber col. 9 lines 5-12 *process rules 50*].

Regarding claim 29, “wherein the information sources are selected from the group of structured information sources, semi-structured information sources, unstructured information sources and combination thereof [note: Weber col. 4 lines 20-49; col. 9 lines 53-60 *may be configured to work with select data types*].

The limitations of claims 9-13, 15-18, 20, 30 and 31 have been addressed above in claims 1-4, 7 and 29; therefore they are rejected under the same rationale.

4. Regarding claims 8, 14 and 22 Webber US Patent 5,909,570 in view of Lennon US Patent 7,287,018 B2 teach the following:

Webber teaches the invention substantially as applied to claim 1; however regarding claim 8, they do not explicitly teach storage bins consisting of an input bin, a wait bin, an incomplete bin, and complete bin”. Lennon teaches descriptors can be complex data types that can be represented in a hierarchical fashion such as in bins [see: col. 15 lines 51-64]. Lennon et al. teaches the descriptors may be extended based

Art Unit: 2169

on the existence or absence of stored descriptors [see: col. 15 line 64-col. 16 line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Lennon et al. with Webber because various storage bins would provide a means of converting and transforming information into a compatible format.

The limitations of claims 14 and 22 have been addressed above in claim 8; therefore they are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed December 21, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the response Applicant argued the following major points:

ARGUMENT: The examiner has rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the invention is a method for extracting and converting data in a computer system, thereby placing the medium within the definition of statutory subject matter.

RESPONSE: Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection cited under 35 USC 101, the rejection has been *withdrawn*.

Art Unit: 2169

ARGUMENT: Applicant argues the field descriptions described in Webber are not input using a graphical user interface, with respect to the limitation “receiving at least one pattern descriptor selected from a graphical user interface”. Applicant argues Webber does not teach that “the pattern descriptor is selected”.

RESPONSE: Lennon was combined with Webber for teaching “receiving at least one pattern descriptor selected from a graphical user interface”. Note, Webber teaches receiving *descriptors* from a source as input into a template or user interface [see: column 7 lines 1-12 receiving computer may be host computer in which case the data may be downloaded into the computer database store 20 with the help of executing software; and column 7 lines 22-38 field descriptions 400 provide details of fields within the table for proper mapping]. Lennon teaches an API interface selecting descriptors based on rule processing. Lennon teaches selection of a pattern descriptor for proper transformation of data [see: column 15 lines 7-11; column 15 lines 45-50 API (i.e. interface) for processing descriptors; column 6 lines 8-51 means for generating a selection rule for selecting a pattern of descriptor components and said action to be performed; column 16 lines 5-17 select descriptions or components of descriptions]. Also, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Art Unit: 2169

ARGUMENT: Webber does not teach storage bins consisting of an input bin, an incomplete bin, and a complete bin.

RESPONSE: regarding limitation directed to storage bins consisting of an input bin, a wait bin, an incomplete bin, and complete bin". Lennon teaches descriptors can be complex data types that can be represented in a hierarchical fashion such as in bins [see: col. 15 lines 51-64]; and that *specific routines or actions may be defined based on selection* of a particular pattern descriptor [see: column 6 lines 8-51]. Lennon et al. teaches the descriptors may be extended based on the existence or absence of stored descriptors [see: col. 15 line 64-col. 16 line 16]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Lennon et al. with Webber because various storage bins would provide a means of converting and transforming information into a compatible format.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2169

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is (571)272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571)272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greta L. Robinson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169
March 23, 2010